

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 26, 2010, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of the claims.

The Examiners, Mr. Riley and Mr. Park, are thanked for the courtesy of the interview granted applicants' attorney on April 29, 2010. In addition to discussing the rejection, the Examiners suggested some amendments to the claims for clarification. The suggested amendments are set forth above. They are not intended to change the scope of the claims. The remaining issues discussed at the interview are summarized in the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16 - 19, and 22 - 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), on the basis of US 6,873,426, hereinafter *Farrell*.

Claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on the basis of *Farrell* in view of *Jeyachandran* (US 6,567,176). Claim 21 was rejected on the basis of *Farrell* in view of *Jeyachandran* and *Trovinger* (US 6,708,967).

For the reasons discussed at the interview and repeated hereinafter, it is respectfully submitted that the applied references do not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art, whether considered individually or in combination.

In summary, claim 1 recites, among other elements, a printing system includes a printer capable of performing a first set of finishing specifications, as well as an off-line finishing device capable of performing a second set of finishing specifications. A sorter ***separates*** the finishing specifics included in the job ticket received by the receiver into those to be performed by the on-line printer and those to be performed by the off-line finishing device. A setting unit sets in the on-line

printer, parameters for the finishing specifics to be performed by the on-line printer, and a creating unit creates data for a finishing device job ticket that includes the finishing specifics to be performed by the off-line finishing device.

Thus, accordingly to claim 1, finishing specifics are separated into two groups, one group to be performed by the on-line printer and a second group to be performed by the off-line finishing device. None of the applied references teaches or suggests the claimed concept of separating finishing specifics into two groups.

According to *Farrell*, there is only one device that can perform finishing, i.e., the finisher 18. The print module 34 has no finishing capabilities. Furthermore, according to *Farrell*, if the finisher 18 cannot perform the assigned finishing specifics, the finishing specifics are changed to alternative or substitute specifics. The specifics are not separated into two groups.

*Farrell* teaches that all of the finishing options are to be performed by the finisher 18. Thus, the finisher 18 is the only structure in *Farrell* that is capable of performing finishing. In contrast, claim 1 recites that the printing system includes a sorter for separating finishing specifics included in a job ticket into those ***to be performed by the on-line printer*** and ***those to be performed by the off-line finishing device***. Thus, the claim requires that there are two finishing devices - one that is on-line with the print server and connected to the printer and the other that is off-line. *Farrell* does not teach separating finishing instructions in to those that can be accomplished by two different units.

*Farrell* does not disclose a printing system that stores information about an on-line printer and a distinct, i.e., off-line, finishing device, such that it is able to assign finishing specifics between the on-line printer and the finishing device about

which it has the information. Rather, to the extent that the system of the *Farrell* patent stores information about finishing capabilities, it is only information about the finishing element 18 of the printer. Thus, the *Farrell* patent only discloses that information relating to the automated finishing capabilities of the printer itself are stored.

The alternate finishing instructions described at column 5, lines 9 - 22, pertain only to the finishing element 18 of the printer 16. Nowhere does the *Farrell* patent suggest that the printing system has knowledge of any of the particulars of an off-line finisher.

Accordingly, *Farrell* does not teach or suggest claim 1.

Claims 2 - 15 are patentable at least for reasons similar to those set forth above.

Claim 16 recites a print server to be used in a printing system including a client, the print server, a printer capable of performing a first set of finishing specifications, and a finishing device that is separately provided from the printer and capable of performing a second set of finishing specifications. The print server comprises a first memory section that stores information on the finishing specifications of the printer and the finisher; and a control section that separates the finishing specifics included in the job ticket received by the receiving section into a first group of finishing specifics to be performed by the printer and a second group of finishing specifics to be performed by the finishing device separately provided from the printer.

The Examiner alleges that such features are taught by *Farrell*. As set forth in claim 16, the claimed control section separates the finishing specifics included in the

job ticket into a first group of finishing specifics to be performed by the printer and a second group of finishing specifics to be performed by the finishing device separately provided from the printer.

In contrast to claim 16, *Farrell* cannot teach such separating based on specifications that can be performed by the finishing device<sup>18</sup> since, as is clear from block 44 in Figure 3, the specifications referred to in blocks 50, 52 are not specifications that can be performed by the finishing device 18.

In addition, *Farrell* teaches that the finishing options are to be performed by the finishing device 18. Thus, the finisher 18 is the only structure in *Farrell* that is capable of performing finishing. In contrast, claim 16 recites a printer capable of performing a first set of finishing specifications, and a finishing device that is separately provided from the printer and capable of performing a second set of finishing specifications.

Thus, the claim requires that there are two finishing devices - one that is installed on the printer and the other that is provided separately. *Farrell* does not teach separating finishing instructions in to those that can be accomplished by two different units.

In the prior response, it was argued that the *Farrell* patent does not disclose a printing system that stores information about an on-line printer and a distinct finishing device that is provided separately, such that it is able to assign finishing specifics between the on-line printer and the finishing device about which it has the information. Rather, to the extent that the system of the *Farrell* patent stores information about finishing capabilities, it is only information about the finishing

element 18 of the printer. Thus, the *Farrell* patent only discloses that information relating to the automated finishing capabilities of the printer itself are stored.

The alternate finishing instructions described at column 5, lines 9 - 22, pertain only to the finishing element 18 of the printer 16. Nowhere does the *Farrell* patent suggest that the printing system has knowledge of any of the particulars of an off-line finisher.

Accordingly, *Farrell* does not teach or suggest claim 16. Claims 17 - 26 are patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Farrell* in combination with U.S. patent No. 6,567,176, hereinafter *Jeyachandran*. For claim 21, U.S. Patent No. 6,708,967, hereinafter *Trovinger* is also used in the rejection. However, the features relied upon from *Jeyachandran* do not overcome the deficiencies set forth above with regard to *Farrell*.

With regard to *Trovinger*, the Examiner alleges that the finishing device is an off-line device. However, that also does not overcome the fact that *Farrell* does not teach or suggest the two different devices for finishing. Accordingly, neither *Jeyachandran* nor *Trovinger* overcome the deficiencies of *Farrell* that are outlined above.

Other distinguishing features of the invention are set forth in the dependent claims. In view of the fundamental difference identified above, a further discussion of these additional distinctions is believed to be unnecessary at this time.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: July 21, 2010

By: /WCRoland/  
William C. Rowland  
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620